

business office to be sure the fee was paid. ECF No. 12. The Court heard nothing more from the Petitioner and the fee was not paid. Therefore, on September 24, 2021, the Court issued a second order to show cause why this action should not be dismissed for failure to prosecute. ECF No. 13. The Court unambiguously informed Petitioner that his action would be dismissed if he failed to respond. *Id.* Petitioner was given fourteen (14) days to answer. Petitioner has failed to respond.

Because Petitioner has failed to comply with the Court's orders or otherwise prosecute his case, his complaint is **DISMISSED WITHOUT PREJUDICE**. See Fed. R. Civ. P. 41(b); *Brown v. Tallahassee Police Dep't*, 205 F. App'x 802, 802 (11th Cir. 2006) ("The court may dismiss an action *sua sponte* under Rule 41(b) for failure to prosecute or failure to obey a court order.") (citing Fed. R. Civ. P. 41(b) and *Lopez v. Aransas Cty. Indep. Sch. Dist.*, 570 F.2d 541, 544 (5th Cir. 1978)).

SO ORDERED, this **19th** day of **October, 2021**.

S/Clay D. Land
CLAY D. LAND, JUDGE
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT